

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

A replacement drawing is submitted for Figure 1b
changing the labels to English

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

The application has been amended to place it in condition for allowance at the time of the next Official Action.

Specification

The specification has been amended to add section heading. No new matter is added.

Drawings

A replacement drawing is submitted for Figure 1b changing the labels from French to English to address the drawing objection noted in the Official Action. The above change is the only change and is believed not to introduce new matter.

Claims

Claims 1-20 remain in this application.

Claim Objection

Claim 13 is amended as suggested in the Official Action to address the claim objection.

35 USC 101 Rejection

Claim 19 is amended to recite an electrical cell as claimed in claim 1 in combination with a movable device. Such

amendment is believed to obviate the 35 USC 101 rejection and withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

35 USC 112, second Rejection

Claims 4, 5, 8, 16, 18 and 19 are amended to address the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejections noted in the Official Action. For the recited devices, claim 1 is amended to recite "a movable device", while claim 4 recites "a device for circulation of the electrolyte" in order to distinguish between the two devices. As to claim 16, this claim does not depend from claim 6. Thus, reciting "flow of activation electrolyte" is believed accurate without adding any further features. As to claim 19, this claim is amended as above and to remove the term "such as". The above changes are believed sufficient to address the rejection and withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

35 USC 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over TRIBIOLI et al. US 5,506,065 in view of CHARLOT et al. EP 0307292 and LEBEN et al. US 4,752,542. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is amended to clarify that the auxiliary electrical cell is configured to supply electrical energy to an engine for the propulsion of the movable device and all members of the electrical cell during the stage of launching. Support

for this feature can be found at least on page 7, lines 15-28 and page 36, lines 8-22 and address the objects of the invention as set forth on page 1, line 17 to page 2, line 16.

In TRIBIOLI, the auxiliary battery 20 is used only to supply the motor of the pump 10 of the battery 1 (see column 3, lines 41-42).

In CHARLOT, the "small auxiliary pile 11" is used only to feed the motor 10 of the pump 9.

In LEBEN, there is no auxiliary battery.

As each of the references fail to disclose that the auxiliary electrical cell is configured to supply electrical energy to an engine for the propulsion of the movable device and all members of the electrical cell during the stage of launching, even if the references were combined in the manner suggested, the invention of claim 1 does not result.

The dependent claims are believed to be patentable at least for depending from an allowable independent claim.

In addition, the interpretation of TRIBIOLI or of claim 2 of the present invention with respect to the "main and secondary electrical energy distribution network" (page 8 of the Official Action) is inconsistent with how one of ordinary skill in the art would construe this phrase.

As understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, the secondary electrical network represented by dotted lines in Figure 1 in TRIBIOLI is only a network used to supply the motor

of the pump of the battery itself. In the present invention, the secondary electrical network is a network used to supply the components (propulsion motor and so on) of the device itself.

Thus, claim 2 is believed to be patentable independent of the patentability of claim 1.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over TRIBIOLI in view of CHARLOT and LEBEN and further in view of MCDERMOTT US Publication No. 2003/0228516. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

MCDERMOTT is only cited with respect to features of claim 3. MCDERMOTT does not overcome the shortcomings of TRIBIOLI, CHARLOT and LEBEN set forth above with respect to claim 1. Since claim 3 depends from claim 1 and further defines the invention, this claim is believed to be patentable at least for depending from an allowable independent claim.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over TRIBIOLI in view of CHARLOT and LEBEN and further in view of TUCKER et al. US 5,733,679. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

TUCKER is only cited with respect to features of claim 9. TUCKER does not overcome the shortcomings of TRIBIOLI, CHARLOT and LEBEN set forth above with respect to claim 1. Since claim 9 depends from claim 1 and further defines the invention, this claim is believed to be patentable at least for depending from an allowable independent claim.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over TRIBIOLI in view of CHARLOT and LEBEN and further in view of DIFRANCESCO et al. US 5,199,487. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

DIFRANCESCO is only cited with respect to features of claim 11. DIFRANCESCO does not overcome the shortcomings of TRIBIOLI, CHARLOT and LEBEN set forth above with respect to claim 1. Since claim 11 depends from claim 1 and further defines the invention, this claim is believed to be patentable at least for depending from an allowable independent claim.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over TRIBIOLI in view of CHARLOT and LEBEN and further in view of RIGO et al. US 4,108,736. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

RIGO is only cited with respect to features of claim 12. RIGO does not overcome the shortcomings of TRIBIOLI, CHARLOT and LEBEN set forth above with respect to claim 1. Since claim 12 depends from claim 1 and further defines the invention, this claim is believed to be patentable at least for depending from an allowable independent claim.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over TRIBIOLI in view of CHARLOT and LEBEN and further in view of SUNSHINE et al. US 6,033,602. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

SUNSHINE is only cited with respect to features of claim 13. SUNSHINE does not overcome the shortcomings of TRIBIOLI, CHARLOT and LEBEN set forth above with respect to claim 1. Since claim 13 depends from claim 1 and further defines the invention, this claim is believed to be patentable at least for depending from an allowable independent claim.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over TRIBIOLI in view of CHARLOT and LEBEN and further in view of DIFRANCESCO and RIGO. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

DIFRANCESCO and RIGO are only cited with respect to features of claim 14. DIFRANCESCO and RIGO do not overcome the shortcomings of TRIBIOLI, CHARLOT and LEBEN set forth above with respect to claim 1. Since claim 14 depends from claim 1 and further defines the invention, this claim is believed to be patentable at least for depending from an allowable independent claim.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over TRIBIOLI in view of CHARLOT and LEBEN and further in view of HONER US 3,966,497. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

HONER is only cited with respect to features of claim 15. HONER does not overcome the shortcomings of TRIBIOLI, CHARLOT and LEBEN set forth above with respect to claim 1. Since claim 15 depends from claim 1 and further defines the invention,

this claim is believed to be patentable at least for depending from an allowable independent claim.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over TRIBIOLI in view of CHARLOT and LEBEN and further in view of DESA et al. US Publication No. 2003/0179652. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

DESA is only cited with respect to features of claim 16. DESA does not overcome the shortcomings of TRIBIOLI, CHARLOT and LEBEN set forth above with respect to claim 1. Since claim 163 depends from claim 1 and further defines the invention, this claim is believed to be patentable at least for depending from an allowable independent claim.

Entry of the above amendments is earnestly solicited. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/Liam McDowell/
Liam McDowell, Reg. No. 44,231
209 Madison Street, Suite 500
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

LM/hc

APPENDIX:

The Appendix includes the following item(s):

- ☒ - a replacement drawing for Figure 1b